

Michigan State University College of Law
Digital Commons at Michigan State University College of Law

Resolutions

The (International) Association of Fish & Wildlife
Agencies Conservation Collection

9-3-1940

Resolution 1940-05-08 Pollution of Waters

Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.msu.edu/afwa_reso



Part of the [Environmental Law Commons](#), and the [Natural Resources Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, *Resolution 1940-05-08 Pollution of Waters* (1940),
Available at: http://digitalcommons.law.msu.edu/afwa_reso/960

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the The (International) Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies Conservation Collection at Digital Commons at Michigan State University College of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Resolutions by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons at Michigan State University College of Law. For more information, please contact domannbr@law.msu.edu.

breeding grounds and have achieved much progress in the conservation of migratory waterfowl;

Resolved, That the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners commends the actions of the government officials of the Dominion of Canada and its several provinces and expresses its gratitude and appreciation therefor;

Resolved further, That the Secretary be authorized to transmit copies of this resolution to all of the game and fish administrators of the Dominion of Canada, the United States of America and the Republic of Mexico.

I move adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Poe: I second the motion.

(The resolution was agreed to.)

Mr. Shawhan: Resolution No. 4

ORGANIZATION OF BIRD PRESERVATION IN SOUTH AMERICA

Whereas the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, in convention assembled at Toronto, Canada, this third day of September, 1940, has learned with great interest of the formation of the (Peruvian) section of the Pan-American Committee for Bird Preservation; be it

Resolved, that this Association extends its greetings and good wishes to our (Peruvian) friends and does hereby offer them our fullest cooperation in any way possible in their efforts to protect and conserve the wildlife of their great country.

I move adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Stephens: I second the motion.

Dr. Pearson: National Sections have been formed in six South American countries. The resolution has been drafted to cover the Peruvian Section, but similar resolutions should be sent to the chairmen of the other five sections as well.

The President: What are the names of the six countries in which national sections have been formed?

Dr. Pearson: Peru, Colombia, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Paraguay. The resolution should be sent to the chairman of the National Committee for Wildlife Preservation in each of these six countries.

(The resolution was agreed to.)

Mr. Shawhan: Resolution No. 5 is as follows:

POLLUTION OF WATERS

Whereas the pollution of the waters of the United States is harmful to wildlife environment and detrimental to the economic welfare of the people, and

Whereas at the Thirty-third Annual Convention of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, held at San Francisco, California, in June, 1939, a resolution was adopted endorsing proper legislation relating to this matter; and

Whereas as yet such legislation has not been enacted; now therefore be it

Resolved, That this Association again urge the passage of such legislation and as contained in the Barkley Bill with Mundt amendments; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be authorized to transmit copies of the resolution to Senator Barkley, Congressman Karl Mundt, the press and all others he deems advisable should be informed of this action.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Hoffmaster: Do I understand that the resolution approves the Barkley Bill with the Mundt amendments or without the Mundt amendments?

Mr. Shawhan: With the Mundt amendments.

Mr. Hoffmaster: We in Michigan have been invoking some local law on this stream-pollution business. We have had occasion to consider the Mundt amendment. We have had occasion to think it through and fit it into our local legislation and our local problems. On two different occasions we have gone on record as against the Mundt amendment. I maintain here that same attitude toward it. I do not think the Mundt amendment should pass.

Mr. Denmead: The two amendments to the Barkley Bill are (1) to declare pollution a public nuisance — it is the first time the United States has ever gone on record as opposing pollution; (2) to prevent future pollution. The second amendment declares that no new sources of pollution, either by sewage or by industrial waste, shall be permitted to be discharged into navigable waters of the United States and streams tributary thereto until and unless approved by the Division of Water Pollution Control. Nobody could possibly object to that unless he wanted to open up to the violators all forms of pollution. I cannot see how our friend Hoffmaster or anybody else can object to stopping pollution from now on — and not entirely stopping it. It seems to me it is the mildest amendment anybody could possibly suggest who really wants to stop future pollution.

I certainly hope the Association will go on record as favoring the Barkley Bill with the Mundt amendments. The rest of the Barkley Bill has been passed on by this Association on more than one occasion. It certainly is very little to ask of this country that it prevent future pollution.

I have not a copy of the bill with me, but it follows the old Lonergan Bill No. 13 so far as state compacts are concerned, and there are other features which I am sure Mr. Hoffmaster and others in Michigan have not properly digested. There certainly has never been any objection to that part of the bill. I hope the resolution will be adopted.

Mr. Hoffmaster: The amendment does not define “new pollutions,” does it?

Mr. Denmead: A number of violators in Ohio and one or two other places have claimed that the words “no new sources of pollution” are indefinite. I cannot agree with that. I think it is quite plain what they mean by it.

Mr. Hoffmaster: Ten years ago, less than 20 per cent of the urban population of Michigan were serviced by sewage-disposal plants; to-day the percentage is 85 per cent. That is pretty good evidence that we are much interested in getting these wastes out of our waters. But we do not believe the Mundt amendment is going to do a thing toward helping get out the remainder of it. So far as we are concerned, it is going to be a handicap.

The President: You have heard the resolution duly moved; is there a seconder?

Mr. Denmead: I will second it.

Mr. LeCompte: I will second the motion.

The President: The resolution has been moved and seconded; all those in favor say "aye."

Some members: Aye.

The President: Those opposed, "No."

Some members: No.

The President: I declare the motion carried.

(The resolution was agreed to.)

Mr. Shawhan: Resolution No. 6:

PITTMAN-ROBERTSON ACT

Whereas the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act, enacted by the Congress of the United States of America, commonly known as the Pittman-Robertson Act, has enabled the several states of the Union to undertake numerous highly desirable wildlife restoration projects which otherwise would have been impossible, and

Whereas the Federal officials in charge have been most cooperative in their efforts to aid the several states to take full advantage of the provisions of this program, and have studiously avoided any semblance of Federal dominion or interference with state rights, and

Whereas a similar program to aid in the restoration and increase of fish life would be of vast benefit to all the states of the United States of America: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, in 34th Annual Convention, assembled in the city of Toronto this 3rd day of September, 1940, urges the prompt enactment of H. R. 6321, known as the Buck Bill, now pending before the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That at the first opportunity the Pittman-Robertson Act, hereinbefore mentioned, be amended to include within its provisions authority to expend a reasonable percentage of Federal-aid funds for the maintenance of such projects as may have been established under its provisions; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be authorized and instructed to transmit copies of these resolutions to Congressman Frank Buck of California, to Congressman A. Willis Robertson of Virginia, to Senator Key Pittman of Nevada, to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and to the several state conservation administrators.

I move adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Stephens: I second the motion.

(The resolution was agreed to.)

Mr. Shawhan: Resolution No. 7:

CONSERVATION EDUCATIONAL PLAN OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Whereas the National Wildlife Federation, through Mr. Lundy, has presented part of its plan to further wildlife conservation through education, and

Whereas material to be used in the operation of its plan is not yet available for examination by the Association, and